DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 142 654 UD 017 172

AUTHOR Mercado, Aurea A.
TITLE Children's Art Carnival Creative Reading Program.
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Office of Educational Evaluation.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 54p.; New York City Board of Education Function No. 09-69635 ; Best copy available

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Art Activities; *Art Education; *Arts Centers; *Elementary Education; Program Descriptions; Program Evaluation; *Reading Instruction
IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; New York (New York); Prescriptive Reading Inventory

ABSTRACT

The implementation of the Children's Art Carnival Creative Reading Program in New York City is evaluated in terms of the services it was designed to provide to 210 Title I eligible children in grades 2 to 5 who were at least one grade behind in reading. Children in the program attended the Art Carnival twice a week and received instruction from reading specialists at school once a week. The activities at the Art Carnival were designed to teach reading through the arts, i.e., printmaking, puppetry, ceramics, painting and animated films. Measurement of skills attained was done with the McGraw Hill Prescriptive Reading Inventory (PRI). Administrators, teachers, staff and school personnel rated this program a success. Tests indicated that a majority of the students mastered most of the objectives. Tables included give detailed test information. (Author/PR)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED142654

EVALUATION REPORT

Title I: B/E
Function # 09-69635

CHILDREN'S ART CARNIVAL
CREATIVE READING PROGRAM

School Year 1975-1976

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

AUREA A. MERCADO, Ph.D.
Evaluation-Consultant

An evaluation of a New York City school district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10) performed for the Board of Education for the 1975-76 school year.

UD017172

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Dr. Anthony J. Polemeni,, Director

Board of Education of the City of New York
Office of Education Evaluation
110 Livingston Street, Brooklyn, N.Y. 11201

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
List of Tables		ii
I	The Program	
	Overview	1
	Instructional Activities	1
	The Staff	2
	Program Participants	3
II	Evaluative Procedures	
	Program Objective	3
	Program Objectives, Instruments, and Methodology	4
	Selection of Participants	5
	Data Collection	6
	Limitation Imposed on Evaluation Procedure	6
III	Findings	
	Findings	7
	Program Implementation Based on Prior Recommendations	21
IV	Summary of Major Findings, Conclusion and Recommendations	21
Appendix A	Program Abstract	24
Appendix B	Data Loss Form, Fall 1975	25
Appendix C	Data Loss Form, Spring 1976	26
Appendix D	MIR Report (N.Y.S. Table 13) (Not under separate cover)	27

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Number and percentage of Participants Demonstrating Mastery of Instructional Objectives After Instruction, 1975-76	7
2 A	Distribution of Pupil Non-Mastery On Pretest And No Posttest Follow-Up, 1975-76	12
2 B	Distribution Of Pupil Mastery Of Instructional Objectives Prior To Instruction, 1975-76	13
2 C	Distribution Of Pupil Mastery By Instructional Objective As A Result Of Instruction, 1975-76	14-15
2 D	Distribution Of The Number Of Instructional Objectives Mastered After Instruction, 1975-76	16
2 E	Distribution Of Percentage of Pupils Achieving Various Levels Of Mastery Of Instructional Objectives, 1975-76	17

I THE PROGRAM

Overview

The Children's Art Carnival Creative Reading Program, a motivational program through the medium of art which was on its second year of Title I funding in 1975-76, was designed to service 210 Title I eligible children in grades 2 to 5 who were at least one grade below in reading. The Program was offered in two independent 18 week sessions, each servicing three groups of approximately 35 children from six participating schools; P.S.98M, P.S.161M, and P.S.126BX in Fall 1975 and P.S.8BK, P.S.132M, and P.S.161M in Spring 1976. The children attended workshops at the Art Carnival for one hour on Tuesdays and Thursdays and received 45 minutes of reading instruction from the reading specialists at the school site on two other days of the week. Each child secured a total of 210 minutes per week of instruction. The basic goal of the Program was to help the children achieve mastery of selected instructional objectives based on individually diagnosed reading needs, which they failed prior to instruction, as measured by a battery of criterion-referenced tests, the McGraw Hill: Prescriptive Reading Inventory (PRI).

Instructional Activities

The Children's Art Carnival provided a highly individualized reading program related to each child's developmental pattern as evidenced in the art workshops. The children involved in the expressive process of the arts;i.e.,printmaking, puppetry, ceramics,

painting, and animated films, were motivated and confident in seeking to communicate and in absorbing information from the written word. The reading and art activities were designed to reinforce experiences at the Art Carnival and at the school site. Instruction was sequential and was flexibly scheduled individually to meet each child's needs as measured by the McGraw Hill: Prescriptive Reading Inventory (PRI).

The Staff

The eight (8) member program staff consisted of a coordinator, two reading specialists, and five artist-teachers.

The full-time coordinator organized pre-planned staff orientation; supervised and observed Title I personnel; coordinated workshops, open house activities, and staff meetings; related the Program to the Parent Advisory Council; and coordinated areas appropriate to the administration of the Program at the Children's Art Carnival which is located at 62 Hamilton Terrace in Central Harlem.

The reading specialists worked two days a week at the Art Carnival and three days a week at the school sites. At the Carnival, they encouraged the pupils to choose art activities suited to their needs; assisted the pupils in writing poems, scripts, character descriptions, and plays elicited from immediate experiences at the workshops and from selected materials at the Art Carnival Story Room (Center Library); developed and prepared teaching materials; maintained on-going records of pupils' progress; and assisted artist-teachers in integrating art-to-language communication skills. At the school sites,

they were actively involved in the implementation of various teaching procedures and held consultations with teachers, counselors, assistant principals, and parents.

The artist-teachers, who are specialists in print-making, puppetry, painting, film-making, and ceramics, taught 3 one hour workshops 2 days a week. They prepared and cleaned the workshops, noted developments as each child became involved in activities, developed vocabulary and comprehension skills in cooperation with the reading specialists, and participated in weekly psychological-staff meetings.

Program Participants

Two hundred and ten (210) Title I eligible children reading one or more years below their grade level were selected to participate in the Program. There were 35 grade 3 pupils at P.S.161M, 35 grade 4 pupils at P.S.98M, and 35 grade 4 pupils at P.S.126BX in Fall 1975; and 35 grade 5 pupils at P.S.132M, 35 grade 5 pupils at P.S.161M, and 35 grades 2 through 5 at P.S.8BK in Spring 1976. This represents one hundred percent (100%) implementation of the Program during the school year 1975-76.

II EVALUATIVE PROCEDURES

Program Objective

The basic objective of the Program was to help pupils achieve mastery of instructional objectives in reading which they fail prior to instruction as measured by the criterion-referenced test, the McGraw Hill: Prescriptive Reading Inventory (PRI) within the eighteen (18) week session.

Program Objectives, Instruments, and Methodology

The objectives, instruments, and methodology are quoted from the July 1975 Evaluation Design prepared by the Office of Educational Evaluation.[1]

Evaluation Objective #1: To determine if, as a result of participating in the program, 70 percent of the pupils master at least three instructional objectives which prior to the program they did not master.

Instruments and Methods. All participants will be administered, as a pretest, selected criterion-referenced tests from the PRI to ascertain individual instructional objectives for each pupil. For each instructional objective diagnosed as requiring remediation, as determined by pretest failure, a post-test will be administered on an individual basis after an appropriate interval of instruction. For each instructional objective, results of passing and failing in both the pretest and post-test will be recorded on the Class Evaluation Record (C.E.R.).

Data will be analyzed and presented in tabular form ascertaining the percentage of participants demonstrating mastery or nonmastery of each instructional objective (according to the State Education Department's classification system) at initial testing and final testing.

Instrument: The McGraw Hill-Prescriptive Reading Inventory (PRI) is designed to diagnose the reading behavior of individual students and to provide information that can be used to reinforce, remediate, or supplement their reading development.[2]

As a battery of criterion-referenced tests, the PRI evaluates each student's mastery of selected objectives, namely; (1) recognition of sound and symbol, (2)phonic analysis, (3)structural analysis, (4)translation, (5)literal comprehension, (6)interpretive comprehension, and (7)critical comprehension.[3]

---

[1]William Roth. Children's Art Carnival. Evaluation Design, B/E #09-69635, Brooklyn, N.Y.:Office of Educational Evaluation.1975.

[2]McGraw Hill:Prescriptive Reading Inventory Examiner's Manual California: CTB/McGraw Hill. 1972.

[3]McGraw Hill: Prescriptive Reading Inventory Individual Diagnostic Map. California: CTB/McGraw Hill. 1974.

Evaluation Objective #2: To determine, as a result of participation in the program the extent to which pupils demonstrate mastery of instructional objectives.

Instruments and Methods. The PRI instrumentation and procedures for pretesting and post-testing are exactly the same as in the implementation of Evaluation Objective #1.

Data will be analyzed and presented in narrative and tabular form to ascertain each of the following:

A) The distribution of pupils failing to demonstrate mastery prior to instruction and not receiving sufficient instruction to receive the post-test.

B) The distribution of pupils demonstrating mastery of objectives prior to instruction.

C) The distribution of pupil mastery as a result of instruction by instructional objectives.

D) The distribution of the number of objectives mastered as a result of instruction.

E) The distribution of percentage of pupils achieving various levels of mastery of instructional objectives.

Evaluation Objective #3: To determine the extent to which the program, as actually carried out, coincided with the program as described in the Project Proposal.

Methods. A comparative descriptive analysis based upon on-site visits and interviews with staff and pupils conducted by the evaluator-consultant will be considered in determining any discrepancies between the project proposal and the program implementation.

Selection of Participants

The variables considered in the selection of the participating pupils attending Title I schools were the results of the Metropolitan Achievement Test (New York Reading Test); recommendations of teachers, guidance counselors, principals, and parents; and the willingness of the classroom teacher to travel with the pupils to the Art Carnival.

Data Collection

The PRI pre/ post tests were administered to the 1975 Fall Session participating pupils during the week of September 29, 1975 and the week of January 12, 1976. The PRI pre/ post tests were administered to the 1976 Spring Session participating pupils during the week of February 2, 1976 and during the week of May 17, 1976.

The evaluator-consultant completed three half-day visits at the Art Carnival on October 7, November 18, and December 16, 1975. There were whole day sets of visits at P.S. 98 and 126 on December 5, 1975; at P.S.8 and P.S.161 on March 24, 1976; and at P.S. 8 and P.S.132 on March 26, 1976. Information about the various activities and responsibilities of the staff were gathered through interviews, conferences, and perusal of records on September 30, 1975, October 7, 1975 and May 28, 1976. A review of the Evaluation Report for the School Year 1974-75 gave the evaluator-consultant an insight into the first year of operation of the Program.[1]

Limitation Imposed on Evaluation Procedures

It should be noted that the Program's Fall Session was for over a sixteen (16) week period instead of the originally planned eighteen week period, due to the city-wide teachers' strike of September 1975.

---

1 Carolyn.N. Hedley. Creative Reading Program at the Children's Art Carnival. Title I E/E Function #09-59635. Brooklyn, New York: Office of Educational Evaluation. 1974-75.

III FINDINGS

The specific observations and findings presented in this section are based on test results, on-site visits to participating schools and the Childrens' Art Carnival, and interviews and conferences with the staff and collaborative personnel.

Findings

Evaluation Objective # 1: To determine if, as a result of participating in the program, 70% of the pupils master at least three instructional objectives which prior to the program they did not master.

Table 1 presents the "head" count of students who mastered the PRI instructional objectives as indicated in the Class Evaluation Records (CER).

Table 1

Number and Percentage of Participants Demonstrating Mastery of Instructional Objectives After Instruction, 1975-76

Number of Objectives Mastered		No. of Pupils	Percentage of Pupils
Grade 3 (N=34)			
Fall 1975	0-2	5	15%
	3-10	29	85%
	11-16	0	0%
Grade 4 (N=62)			
Fall 1975	0-2	12	20%
	3-10	50	80%
	11-20	0	0%
Grades 2 & 3 (N=24)			
Spring 1976	0-2	1	4%
	3-11	23	96%
	12-16	0	0%
Grade 4 & 5 (N=73)			
Spring 1976	0-2	2	3%
	3-10	71	97%
	11-20	0	0%

During the Fall session, 34 Grade 3 and 62 Grade 4 pupils, a total of 96 children attended workshops at the Art Carnival and received reading instruction from the reading specialists. Eighty-five (85%) of the Grade 3 and 80% of the Grade 4 participating pupils mastered more than three PRI instructional objectives.

During the Spring session, 19 Grade 2 and 5 Grade 3 pupils and 4 Grade 4 and 69 Grade 5 pupils, a total of 97 pupils attended the workshops at the Art Carnival and received reading instruction from the reading specialists at the school-sites, Ninety-six (96%) of Grades 2 and 3 pupils and 97% of the Grades 4 and 5 pupils mastered more than three PRI instructional objectives.

The findings indicate that evaluation objective #1 has been achieved for more than 70% of the pupils mastered more than three instructional objectives which prior to the program they did not master.

Evaluation Objective #2: To determine, as a result of participation in the program the extent to which pupils demonstrate mastery of instructional objectives.

It was noted that the SED classification is too broad for the PRI instructional objectives which are definitive. The PRI objectives lose their specificity and identity in the broad context of the SED classification, e.g.: 2107 SED which is the code for "vowels: more than one letter" is supposed to include four PRI objectives, namely; silent vowels, variant vowels-sounds y, variant vowels-sounds r controlled, and phonetic parts-variant

sounds. It should also be noted that five Grade 5 pupils were additionally tested with PRI level C because they indicated mastery of some objectives beyond PRI level B.

It is further noted that MIR Table 13 does not allow for entry of the number of students in an individualized reading program who failed in the pre-test and were given instruction and the number of pupils who failed in the pre-test and were not given instruction. The data from MIR Table 13 does not give a precise indication of the effectiveness of an individualized instructional program. Data analyses of MIR Table 13 would not cross-check with Table 2C which indicates the distribution of pupil mastery by instructional objectives as a result of instruction.

Table 2 A shows the distribution of pupil non-mastery on pre-test and no posttest follow-up. The data indicate that:

1. Among the 34 Grade 3, Fall 1975 pupils-
   50% failed 9 to 12 PRI objectives,
   35% failed 5 to 8 PRI objectives,
   12% failed 13 to 16 PRI objectives, and
   3% failed 0 to 4 PRI objectives.
2. Among the 24 Grades 2 and 3, Spring 1976 pupils-
   37% failed 9 to 12 PRI objectives,
   17% failed 5 to 8 objectives,
   46% failed 13 to 16 PRI objectives, and
   0% failed 0 to 4 PRI objectives.
3. Among the 62 Grade 4, Fall 1975 pupils-
   40% failed 13 to 16 PRI objectives,
   32% failed 17 to 20 PRI objectives,
   21% failed 9 to 12 objectives,
   7% failed 5 to 8 objectives, and
   0% failed 0 to 4 PRI objectives.

4. Among the 73 Grades 4 and 5 Spring, 1976 pupils-
   18% failed 13 to 16 PRI objectives,
   11% failed 17 to 20 PRI objectives,
   33% failed 9 to 12 PRI objectives,
   33% failed 5 to 8 PRI objectives, and
   5% failed 0 to 4 PRI objectives.

Table 2B shows the distribution of pupil mastery of instructional objectives prior to instruction. The data indicate that:

1. Among the 34 Grade 3, Fall 1975 pupils-
   53% mastered 26% to 50% of the 16 PRI objectives
   26% mastered 51% to 75% of the 16 PRI objectives,
   21% mastered 0% to 25% of the 16 PRI objectives, and
   0% mastered 76% to 100%.
2. Among the 62 Grade 4, Fall 1975 pupils-
   40% mastered 26% to 50% of the 20 PRI objectives.
   15% mastered 51% to 75% of the 20 PRI objectives.
   45% mastered 0% to 25% of the 20 PRI objectives, and
   0% mastered 76% to 100% of the 20 PRI objectives.
3. Among the 24 Grades 2 and 3, Spring 1976 pupils-
   34% mastered 26% to 50% of the 16 PRI objectives,
   17% mastered 51% to 75% of the 16 PRI objectives,
   49% mastered 0% to 25% of the 16 PRI objectives, and
   0% mastered 76% to 100%.
4. Among the 73 Grades 4 and 5, Spring 1976 pupils-
   30% mastered 26% to 50% of the 20 PRI objectives,
   46% mastered 51% to 75% of the 20 PRI objectives,
   18% mastered 0% to 25% of the 20 PRI objectives,
   6% mastered 76% to 100% of the 20 PRI objectives.

Table 2 C shows the distribution of pupil mastery by instructional objective as a result of instruction. The data indicated that:

1. There was mastery of objectives among the Grade 3, Fall 1975 pupils; 100% for 2102 and 2412, 94% for 2304 and 2401, 92% for 2104, 85% for 2406, 83% for 2303, 82% for 2106, 79% for 2408, 75% for 2205 and 2403, 69% for 2411, 67% for 2404, 64% for 2107, 60% for 2409, and 40% for 2105.

2. There was mastery of objectives among the Grade 4, Fall 1975 pupils; 100% for 2303 and 2412, 94% for 2406, 90% for 2101, 82% for 2110, 80% for 2205, 79% for 2305, 73% for 2401, 67% for 2109, and 2304, 66% for 2106, 59% for 2107, 53% for 2102 and 2104, 50% for 2206

and 2404, 45% for 2411, and 0% for 2403, 2408, and 2409.

3. There was mastery of objectives among the Grades 2 and 3, Spring 1976 pupils; 100% for 2304, 94% for 2401, 87% for 2107, 86% for 2406 and 2412, 82% for 2106 and 2411, 73% for 2205, 71% for 2404, 70% for 2102, 67% for 2105 and 2303, 65% for 2403, 56% for 2104, 53% for 2408, and 37% for 2409.

4. There was mastery of objectives among the Grades 4 and 5, Spring 1976 pupils; 100% for 2101 and 2303, 96% for 2110, 95% for 2205, 92% for 2107, 91% for 2305, 89% for 2102 and 2104, 87% for 2304 and 2404, 85% for 2412, 83% for 2409, 80% for 2106, 75% for 2401, 72% for 2206, 70% for 2403, 68% for 2406, 61% for 2411, 60% for 2408, and 55% for 2109.

Table 2 D shows the distribution of the number of instructional objectives mastered after instruction. The data indicate that:

1. Among the 34 Grade 3, Fall 1975 pupils;
   32% mastered 3 to 4 objectives and 5 to 6 objectives, 15% mastered 7 to 8 objectives, 12% mastered 1 to 2 objectives, 6 % mastered 9 to 10 objectives, and 3% mastered 0 objectives.
2. Among the 62 Grade 4, Fall 1975 pupils;
   32% mastered 5 to 6 objectives, 27% mastered 3 to 4 objectives, 18% mastered 7 to 8 objectives, 15% mastered 1 to 2 objectives, 3% mastered 9 to 10 objectives, and 5% mastered 0 objectives.
3. Among the 24 Grades 2 and 3, Spring 1976 pupils;
   38% mastered 7 to 8 objectives, 34% mastered 5 to 6 objectives, 12% mastered 9 to 10 objectives, 8% mastered 3 to 4 objectives, and 4% mastered 1 to 2 objectives and 11 objectives.

TABLE 2 A

DISTRIBUTION OF PUPIL NON-MASTERY ON PRETEST AND NO POSTTEST FOLLOW-UP, 1975-76

No. of Instructional Objectives Failed	No. of Pupils Who Failed	Percentage of Pupils Who Failed
Grade 3 (N=34) Fall 1975		
13-16	4	12%
9-12	17	50%
5- 8	12	35%
0- 4	1	3%
Grade 4 (N=62) Fall 1975		
17-20	20	32%
13-16	25	40%
9-12	13	21%
5- 8	4	7%
0- 4	0	0%
Grades 2 & 3 (N=24) Spring 1976		
13-16	11	46%
9-12	9	37%
5- 8	4	17%
0- 4	0	0%
Grades 4 & 5 (N=73) Spring 1976		
17-20	8	11%
13-16	13	18%
9-12	24	33%
5- 8	24	33%
0- 4	4	5%

TABLE 2 B

DISTRIBUTION OF PUPIL MASTERY OF INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES PRIOR TO INSTRUCTION, 1975-76

Percentage of Mastery of Instructional Objectives	Number of Pupils	Percentage of Pupils
Grade 3, Fall 1975 (N=34)		
76 - 100% (13-16)	0	0%
51 - 75% (9-12)	9	26%
26 - 50% (5- 8)	18	53%
0 - 25% (0- 4)	7	21%
Grade 4, Fall 1976 (N=62)		
76 - 100% (16-20)	0	0%
51 - 75% (11-15)	9	15%
26 - 50% (6-10)	25	40%
0 - 25% (0- 5)	28	45%
Grades 2 & 3, Spring 1976 (N=24)		
76 - 100% (13-16)	0	0%
51 - 75% (9-12)	4	17%
26 - 50% (5- 8)	8	34%
0 - 25% (0- 4)	12	49%
Grades 4 & 5, Spring 1976 (N=73)		
76 - 100% (16-20)	4	6%
51 - 75% (11-15)	34	46%
26 - 50% (6-10)	22	30%
0 - 25% (0- 5)	13	18%

TABLE 2 C

DISTRIBUTION OF PUPIL MASTERY BY INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVE AS A RESULT OF INSTRUCTION, 1975-76

	Instructional Objectives	Ratio of # Pupils Achieving/ # Pupils Attempting Mastery	Percentage of Mastery
Grade 3			
Fall 1975	2102	07/07	100%
	2104	11/12	92%
	2105	04/10	40%
	2106	18/22	82%
	2107	14/22	64%
	2205	03/04	75%
	2303	05/06	83%
	2304	15/16	94%
	2401	16/17	94%
	2403	12/16	75%
	2404	04/06	67%
	2406	17/20	85%
	2408	15/19	79%
	2409	06/10	60%
	2411	11/16	69%
	2412	14/14	100%
Grade 4			
Fall 1975	2101	36/40	90%
	2102	10/19	53%
	2104	10/19	53%
	2106	38/57	66%
	2107	25/42	59%
	2109	01/03	67%
	2110	27/33	82%
	2205	08/10	80%
	2206	03/06	50%
	2303	02/02	100%
	2304	22/33	67%
	2305	15/19	79%
	2401	08/11	73%
	2403	00/01	0%
	2404	15/30	50%
	2406	48/51	94%
	2408	00/00	0%
	2409	00/00	0%
	2411	19/42	45%
	2412	01/01	100%

TABLE 2 C (continued)

DISTRIBUTION OF PUPIL MASTERY BY INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVE AS A RESULT OF INSTRUCTION, 1975-76

Instructional Objectives	Ratio of # Pupils Achieving/ # Pupils Attempting Mastery	Percentage of Mastery
Grades 2 & 3 Spring 1976		
2102	07/10	70%
2104	09/16	56%
2105	08/12	67%
2106	14/17	82%
2107	13/15	87%
2205	08/11	73%
2303	06/09	67%
2304	07/07	100%
2401	15/16	94%
2403	11/17	65%
2404	05/07	71%
2406	19/22	86%
2408	08/15	53%
2409	03/08	37%
2411	09/11	82%
2412	19/22	86%
Grades 4 & 5 Spring 1976		
2101	30/30	100%
2102	25/28	89%
2104	25/28	89%
2106	28/35	80%
2107	44/48	92%
2109	20/36	55%
2110	22/23	96%
2205	19/20	95%
2206	26/36	72%
2303	08/08	100%
2304	07/08	87%
2305	21/23	91%
2401	06/08	75%
2403	19/27	70%
2404	14/16	87%
2406	32/47	68%
2408	18/30	60%
2409	15/18	83%
2411	19/31	61%
2412	33/39	85%

TABLE 2 D

DISTRIBUTION OF THE NUMBER OF INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES MASTERED AFTER INSTRUCTION, 1975-76

No. of Instructional Objectives Mastered	No. of Pupils	Percentage of Pupils
Grade 3, Fall 1975 (N=34)		
0	1	3%
1 - 2	4	12%
3 - 4	11	32%
5 - 6	11	32%
7 - 8	5	15%
9 -10	2	6%
11 -16	0	0%
Grade 4, Fall 1975 (N=62)		
0 -	3	5%
1 - 2	9	15%
3 - 4	17	27%
5 - 6	20	32%
7 - 8	11	18%
9 -10	2	3%
11 -20	0	0%
Grades 2 & 3, Spring 1976 (N=24)		
0	0	0%
1 - 2	1	4%
3 - 4	2	8%
5 - 6	8	34%
7 - 8	9	38%
9 -10	3	12%
11 -	1	4%
12 -20	0	0%
Grades 4 & 5, Spring 1976 (N=73)		
0	0	0%
1 - 2	2	3%
3 - 4	9	12%
5 - 6	33	45%
7 - 8	23	32%
9 -10	6	8%
11 -20	0	0%

TABLE 2 E

DISTRIBUTION OF PERCENTAGE OF PUPILS ACHIEVING VARIOUS LEVELS OF MASTERY OF INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES, 1975-76

Percentage of Mastery of Instructional Objectives (# of Objectives Achieved/ # of Objectives Attempted)		No. of Pupils	Percentage of Pupils
Grade 3 - Fall 1975			
(N=34)	90-100%	14	41%
	80-89 %	4	11%
	70-79 %	6	17%
	60-69 %	3	8%
	50-59 %	2	5%
	40-49 %	2	5%
	30-39 %	3	8%
	20-29 %	0	0%
	10-19 %	0	0%
	0- 9 %	2	5%
Grade 4 - Fall 1975			
(N=62)	90-100%	22	34%
	80-89 %	11	18%
	70-79 %	7	12%
	60-69 %	8	13%
	50-59 %	2	3%
	40-49 %	0	0%
	30-39 %	2	3%
	20-29 %	4	7%
	10-19 %	4	7%
	0- 9 %	2	3%
Grades 2 & 3 - Spring 1976			
(N=24)	90-100%	8	34%
	80-89 %	5	21%
	70-79 %	3	12%
	60-69 %	5	21%
	50-59 %	1	4%
	40-49 %	1	4%
	30-39 %	1	4%
	20-29 %	0	0%
	10-19 %	0	0%
	0- 9 %	0	0%
Grade 5 - Spring 1976			
(N=73)	90-100%	26	36%
	80-89 %	23	32%
	70-79 %	11	15%
	60-69 %	6	8%
	50-59 %	2	3%
	40-49 %	4	5%
	30-39 %	0	0%
	20-29 %	1	1%
	10-19 %	0	0%
	0- 9 %	0	0%

4. Among the 73 Grades 4 and 5, Spring 1976 pupils; 45% mastered 5 to 6 objectives, 32% mastered 7 to 8 objectives, 12% mastered 3 to 4 objectives, 8% mastered 9 to 10 objectives, and 3% mastered 1 to 2 objectives.

Table 2 E shows the distribution of percentage of pupils achieving various levels of mastery of instructional objectives. The data indicate that:

1. Among the 34 Grade 3, Fall 1975 pupils, that 69% of the pupils achieved 70% to 100% of objectives.
2. Among the 62 Grade 4, Fall 1975 pupils, 64% of the pupils achieved 70% to 100% mastery of objectives.
3. Among the 24 Grades 2 and 3, Spring 1976 pupils, 67% of the pupils achieved 70% to 100% master of objectives.
4. Among the 73 Grades 4 and 5, Spring 1976 pupils, 83% of the pupils achieved 70% to 100% mastery of objectives.

Evaluation Objective #3: To determine the extent to which program, as actually carried out, coincided with the program as described in the project proposal.

On-site visits and observations, interviews and conferences with the staff and personnel at the Childrens' Art Carnival and at the participating schools revealed that the Program was carried out as described in the Proposal. It was noted that:

- The project coordinator and the staff were very supportive of the Program.
- The job description of the staff differentiated responsibilities of the personnel.
- The children appeared delighted to be in the Art Carnival

and enjoyed participating in all the activities.

- The children who were involved in the personally expressive program progressed from a non-participant to an active participant in the workshops and in small group activities.

- Absence of the children at the Art Carnival was nil and absence at the small group meeting was minimal.

- Creative work of the children were displayed. Children produced puppets, poems, stories, paintings, prints, pottery, and animated films.

- The children worked on reading and communication skill-oriented activities in small groups at the school sites. The activities were predicated on art experiences at the Childrens' Art Carnival.

- There was pervasive staff interaction and high staff morale. The enthusiasm was carried through by the participating classroom teachers and the reading specialists into the classrooms.

- Library resources were tripled by donations from McGraw-Hill and Random House Publishers and from the Museum of Modern Art.

- Instructional materials at the Art Carnival which were used by the particpating pupils were partly funded by Title I and by the Childrens' Art Carnival.

- Some district administrators had requested for school participation in the program.

- There were excellent teaching materials prepared by the reading specialists.

- Some school personnel did not seem to fully understand the goals and logistics of the program.

- A great deal of internal evaluation was performed by the artist teachers and reading specialists. They used logs and video-tapes to analyze teacher-pupil performances.

- Once a week, the staff of the program and the Staff of psychologists from the City University of New York met to discuss the childrens' problems, growth, and development.

There was a discrepancy between the grade levels designated in the Proposal and implemented in the Program. The

Proposal designated participants from target schools; P.S. 8, C.S.77, P.S.98, P.S.123, and P.S.186. The Program was implemented at P.S.8, P.S.98, P.S.126, P.S.132, and P.S.161.

The severe budget reductions had resulted in a large scale reorganization of schools and classrooms, to which the Program had to adapt. The total budget for the school year 1975-76 including direct costs was $100,100.00. This represented a per pupil cost of $491.00 in Fall 1975 and $477.00 in Spring 1976 based upon a population of 102 in Fall and 105 in Spring.

Program Implementation Based on Prior Recommendations

The comments on the ten recommendations stated in the Hedley Report of School Year 1974-75 were based on observations, interviews, conferences, and a study of the 1975-76 Project Proposal.

Recommendation #1: The supplementary services as available to the schools the previous year (1974-75) had been maintained.
Budgetary limitations did not permit writing it in the Proposal.

Recommendation #2: The children should not be brought from long distances, over 20 minutes to a half hour, to the Carnival.
Limiting the distance allowable for children to come to the Art Carnival had been rejected. The restriction would deprive potential participants beyond a 20 mile commutation time from the benefits of a Title I program to which they were legally entitled.

Recommendations #3 and #4: More liaison work with the schools should be done. Culminating activities should receive more attention.
Expanding public relations, brochure printing, and program activities beyond those engaged in during the previous year were not possible under the 1975-76 personnel and budgetary limitations.

Recommendation #5: The Prescriptive Reading Inventory is a long and cumbersome test.
The replacement of the 27 page McGraw-Hill-Prescriptive Reading Inventory as a diagnostic instrument had been rejected because the staff felt that the PRI had the best diagnostic capability for the reading problems encountered among the participating target population, e.g.; the Stanford Diagnostic Test fails to place students for maximum

validity and the Pope Inventory lacks comprehensive objective coverage.

Recommendation #6: More parent participation should be encouraged.

Since the Parent Advisory Council requires that members be parents of participating children, parents had been encouraged to become actively involved. Beyond this, it can only be said that the daytime activities of parents can not be coerced.

Recommendation #7: The call for longer teaching sessions with one less public school tutorial session, had been rejected in terms of the limitation of the children's attention span and the importance of the tutorial assistance. However, the recommendation had been partially implemented by extending the instructional cycle from 12 to 18 week sessions.

Recommendation #8: The call for an earlier end of teaching to help meet the evaluation deadline had been implemented. The post testing date had been schedule for mid-May 1976.

Recommendation #9: Supplies should be more abundant and a greater variety of materials should be used.

Budgetary limitations had caused rejection of the call for the enrichment of materials at greater expense. In fact, the Program had come to rely heavily on donations from publishing companies, art museums, and donations of art and other materials.

Recommendation #10: The preceding year's call for extending the Program upwards to the 5th graders (age 11 or more) had been implemented in Spring 1976.

IV SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

There was unanimous endorsement of the Program from the administrators, teachers, staff, and school personnel. Test results indicate that more than 70% of the pupils mastered more than three instructional objectives; that 85% of the 34 Grade 3, Fall 1975 pupils mastered 3 to 10 objectives, that 80% of the 62 Grade 4, Fall 1975 pupils mastered 3 to 10 objectives,

that 96% of the 24 Grades 2 and 3, Spring 1976 pupils mastered 3 to 11 objectives, and that 97% of 73 Grades 4 and 5 pupils mastered 3 to 10 objectives. The test results also indicate that 69% of the 34 Grade 3, Fall 1975 pupils that 64% of the 62 Grade 4, Fall 1975 pupils, that 67% of 24 Grades 2 and 3, Spring 1976 pupils and that 83% of the 73 Grades 4 and 5, 1976 Spring pupils had achieved 70% to 100% mastery of objectives.

It can be condluded that the Program was able to achieve its objective.

On the basis of the findings, it is recommended that:

1. The program be recycled and expanded for the school year 1976-77.
2. Provision be made for encouraging library resources and instructional materials support from donors in view of budgetary limitations.
3. The "voluntary" services of the Psycho-educational Team be requested and made continually available to participating pupils with special problems.
4. A Mobile Art Carnival and/or a District Mini-Art Carnival be considered in forthcoming proposals to allow for participation of all 32 Title I school districts.
5. The modification of the use of the PRI (The Red Book, Level A for grades 1 to 3, contains 123 items covering 22 reading objectives and the Green Book, Level B for grades 4 to 6, contains 153 items covering 32 reading objectives are

administered from 4 to 6 sessions for a total of 3 1/2 to 4 hours) be considered within the framework of the inclusion of items exploring basic phonic and comprehension skills and the exclusion of other items.

6. The SED objectives be reviewed, modified, and revised by expanding the categories on basic phonic and comprehensive skills to allow for diagnostic specificity of the criterion-referenced McGraw Hill: Prescriptive Reading Inventory.

7. The MIR Table 13 be reviewed to allow for modification of criterion-referenced test data entry that would indicate parameters (extra columns) in assessing effectiveness of individualized instruction; i.e.; students who fail in the pre-test may reveive or may not receive instruction to achieve mastery due to staff and/or time limitations.

8. Sixth grade[illegible]ils be given an opportunity to be involved in the expressive art-oriented reading program.

9. The excellent staff-prepared teaching materials be made available to the cooperating teachers who assist in reinforcing the development of reading skills in the classroom and who travel with the children to the Art Carnival.

10. The program be submitted for validation for state and national dissemination under Title IV-C at the Offices of "Programs That Work" at Albany, New York and Washington, D.C.

11. The program was designed to serve 30 children at any one time in the workshops. Currently the program is serving 35 students. If possible, within current budgetary restraints, the program workshops should serve only 30 children at one time.

APPENDIX A

PROGRAM ABSTRACT

The Childrens' Art Carnival Creative Reading Program, a motivational program through the medium of art which was on its second year of Title I funding in 1975-76, was designed to service 210 Title I eligible children in grades 2 to 5 who were at least one grade below in reading. The Program was offered in two independent 18 week sessions, each servicing three groups of approximately 35 children from six participating schools; P.S.98M,P.S.161M,P.S.126BX, in Fall 1975 and P.S.8BK,P.S.132M,and P.S.161M in Spring 1976. The children attended workshops at the Art Carnival for one hour on Tuesdays and Thursdays and received 45 minutes of reading instruction from the reading specialists at the school site on two other days of the week. The basic goal of the Program was to help the children achieve mastery of selected instructional objectives based on individually diagnosed reading needs, which they failed prior to instruction, as measured by a battery of criterion-referenced tests, the McGraw Hill: Prescriptive Reading Inventory.

As a result of participation in the Program, 85% of Grade 3 and 81% of Grade 4, Fall 1975 and 96% of Grades 2&3and 97% of Grades 4&5, Spring 1976 participating children mastered from 3 to 10 PRI objectives. Sixty-nine percent(69%) of Grade 3,64% of Grade 4,67%of Grades 2&3,and 83% of Grades 4&5 participating pupils achieved 70% to 100% mastery of instructional objectives. The Program was carried out as described in the Program Proposal. There was unanimous endorsement of the Program from administration, teachers, staff, and collaborative personnel.It is recommended that the Program be recycled,expanded,and submitted for validation for state and national dissemination under Title IV-C, "Programs that Work" at Albany,New York and WashingtonDD.C. for the following school year.

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION - DATA LOSS FORM FALL 1975

(attach to NARRATIVE) Function #09-69635

In this table enter all Data Loss information. Between the MIR and this form, all participants in each activity must be accounted for. The component and activity codes used in completion of the MIR should be used here so that the two tables match. See definitions below table for further instructions.

Component Code	Activity Code	(1) Group I.D.	(2) Test Used	(3) Total N	(4) Number Tested/ Analyzed	(5) Participants Not Tested/ Analyzed N	(5) %	(6) Reasons Why Students Were Not Tested, Or IF Tested, Were Not Analyzed	Number
6 0 8 1 4 0 0	7 2 0	Grade 4	PRI McGraw Hill B Green	70	62	8	11%	emotionally unable to participate in program	3
								left program before post-testing - moved	3
								Serious language problem N.E.moved to Bilingual class	1
								Truant	1
6 0 8 1 3 0 0	7 2 0	Grade 3	PRI McGraw Hill A Red	35	34	1	3	Moved-left program before Post-testing	1

(1) Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 9). Where several grades are combined, enter the last two digits of the component code.
(2) Identify the test used and year of publication (MAT-70, SDAT-74, Houghton Mifflin (IPMS Level 1 etc.)
(3) Number of participants in the activity.
(4) Number of participants included in the pre and posttest calculations.
(5) Number and percent of participants not tested and/or not analyzed.
(6) Specify all reasons why students were not tested and/or analyzed. If any further documentation is available, please attach to this form. If further space is needed to specify and explain data loss, attach additional pages to this form.
(7) For each reason specified, provide separate number count.

APPENDIX C

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION - DATA LOSS FORM SPRING 1976
(attach to NARRATIVE) Function # 09-69635

In this table enter all Data Loss information. Between the MIR and this form, all participants in each activity must be accounted for. The component and activity codes used in completion of the MIR should be used here so that the two tables match. See definitions below table for further instructions.

Component Code	Activity A Code	(1) Group I.D.	(2) Test Used	(3) Total N	(4) Number Tested/ Analyzed	(5) Participants Not Tested/ Analyzed N	(5) %	(6) Reasons Why Students Were Not Tested, Or If Tested, Were Not Analyzed	Number
6 0 8 1 4 0 0	7 2 0	Grades 4 & 5	PRI McGraw Hill Green	80	73	7	9	Came late into program- no time for posttest	3
								Truant	3
								Non-English severe language problem	1
6 0 8 1 3 0 0	7 2 0	Grades 2 & 3	PRI McGraw Hill Red	25	24	1	4	Moved before post-testing	1

(1) Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g.,grade 3, grade 9). Where several grades are combined enter the last two digits of the component code.
(2) Identify the test used and year of publication (MAT-70,SDAT-74, Houghton Mifflin (IPMS) Level 1 etc.
(3) Number of participants in the activity.
(4) Number of participants included in the pre and posttest calculations.
(5) Number and percent of participants not tested and/or not analyzed.
(6) Specify all reasons why students were not tested and/or analyzed. If any further documentation is available, please attach to this form. If further space is needed to specify and explain data loss, attach additional pages to this form.
(7) For each reason specified, provide a separate number count.

APPENDIX D

M.I.R. REPORT

N.Y. STATE TABLE 13

The University of the State of New York
THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Bureau of Urban and Community Programs Evaluation
Albany, New York 12234

MAILED INFORMATION REPORT FOR CATEGORICALLY AIDED EDUCATION PROJECTS

SECTION II

1975-76 School Year

Due Date: July 1, 1976

SED Project Number: | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 7 | 6 | | 0 | 0 | 2 | | | |

BE Function Number (N.Y.C. only): | 0 | 9 | 6 | 9 | 6 | 3 | 5 |

Project Title Children's Art Carnival

Creative Reading Program

School District Name Children's Art Carnival (District 75)

Schoold District Address 62 Hamilton Terrace

New York, N.Y. 10031

Name and Title of Person Completing this form:

Name Dr. Aurea A. Mercado

Title Evaluation-Consultant

Telephone Number 201 289-6798
(Area Code)

Date this form was completed June / 14 / 1976 /

PROGRAM ABSTRACT

The Childrens' Art Carnival Creative Reading Program, a motivational program through the medium of art which was on its second year of Title I funding in 1975-76, was designed to service 210 Title I eligible children in grades 2 to 5 who were at least one grade below in reading. The Program was offered in two independent 18 week sessions, each servicing three groups of approximately 35 children from six participating schools; P.S.98M, P.S.161M, and P.S.126BX in Fall 1975 and P.S.8BK, P.S.132M, and P.S.161M in Spring 1976. The children attended workshops at the Art Carnival for one hour on Tuesdays and Thursdays and received 45 minutes of reading instruction from the reading specialists at the school site on two other days of the week. The basic goal of the Program was to help the children achieve mastery of selected instructional objectives based on individually diagnosed reading needs, which they failed prior to instruction, as measured by a battery of criterion-referenced tests, the McGraw Hill: Prescriptive Reading Inventory.

As a result of participation in the Program, 85% of Grade 3 and 81% of Grade 4, Fall 1975; and 96% of Grades 2 & 3 and 97% of Grades 4 & 5, Spring 1976 participating children mastered from 3 to 10 PRI objectives. Sixty-nine percent(69%) of Grade 3, 64% of Grade 4, 67% of Grades 2 & 3, and 83% of Grades 4 & 5 participating pupils achieved 70% to 100% mastery of instructional objectives. The Program was carried out as described in the Program Proposal. There was unanimous endorsement of the Program from administration, teachers, staff, and collaborative personnel. It is recommended that the Program be recycled, expanded, and submitted for validation for state and national dissemination under Title IV-C,"Programs that Work" at Albany, New York and Washington DC for the following school year.

N.Y. STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

CLASSIFICATION OF INSTRUCTIONAL MASTERY
IN READING
For Use on Table 13

Code	Instructional Objective
	PHONETIC ANALYSIS
2101	Letter Recognition
2102	Initial Consonants
2103	Medial Consonants
2104	Final Consonants and Blends
2105	Consonant Blends
2106	Vowels: Single Letters
2107	Vowels: More than one Letter
2108	Consonant Digraph
2109	Silent Consonants, Hards and Soft C & G
2110	Rhyming Words
	STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS
2201	Compound Words
2212	Contractions
2203	Endings
2204	Prefixes, Suffixes, Affixes
2205	Syllables
2206	Prepositions, Phrases
2207	Sentence Structure
2208	Punctuation
	VOCABULARY
2301	Antonyms
2302	Homographs
2303	Homonyms
2304	Synonyms
2305	Word Meaning
2306	Heteronyms
	COMPREHENSION
2401	Fantasy and Reality
2402	Classifying
2403	Inferences, Cause or Effect
2404	Facts and Details
2405	Following Directions
2406	Main Ideas
2407	Picture Clues
2408	Drawing Conclusions
2409	Sequence
2410	Literary Forms
2411	Author's Purpose and Techniques
2412	Setting and Character Analysis
2413	Figures of Speech, Idioms, Colloquialisms, etc.
2414	Comparisons, Analogies, Similes, Metaphors, etc.

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Grade 3 - Fall 1975 (N-34)

Component Code	Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils Passing (1)	Pretest No. of Pupils Failing (2)	Posttest No. of Pupils From Co. (2) Passing	Posttest No. of Pupils From Col. (2) Failing
6 0 8 1 3 0 0	2 1 0 2	McGraw Hill:PR1	A-Red	25	9	7	2
6 0 8 1 3 0 0	2 1 0 4	" " "	"	20	14	11	3
6 0 8 1 3 0 0	2 1 0 5	" " "	"	23	11	4	7
6 0 8 1 3 0 0	2 1 0 6	" " "	"	11	23	18	5
6 0 8 1 3 0 0	2 1 0 7	" " "	"	12	22	14	8
6 0 8 1 3 0 0	2 2 0 5	" " "	"	22	12	3	9
6 0 8 1 3 0 0	2 3 0 3	" " "	"	28	6	5	1
6 0 8 1 3 0 0	2 3 0 4	" " "	"	7	27	15	12

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Grade 3 - Fall 1975 (continued)

Component Code	Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils Passing (1)	Pretest No. of Pupils Failing (2)	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Passing	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Failing
6 0 8 1 3 0 0	2 4 0 1	McGraw Hill:PR1	A-Red	16	18	13	2
6 0 8 1 3 0 0	2 4 0 3	" " "	"	6	28	12	16
6 0 8 1 3 0 0	2 4 0 4	" " "	"	18	16	4	12
6 0 8 1 3 0 0	2 4 0 6	" " "	"	10	24	17	7
6 0 8 1 3 0 0	2 4 0 8	" " "	"	7	27	15	12
6 0 8 1 3 0 0	2 4 0 9	" " "	"	6	28	6	22
6 0 8 1 3 0 0	2 4 1 1	" " "	"	10	24	10	14
6 0 8 1 3 0 0	2 4 1 2	" " "	"	16	18	14	4

-4-

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery Codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Grade 4 - Fall 1975 (N=62)

Component Code	Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils		Posttest	
				Passing (1)	Failing (2)	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Passing	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Failing
6 0 8 1 4 0 0	2 1 0 1	McGraw Hill; PRI	B-Green	14	48	37	11
6 0 8 1 4 0 0	2 1 0 2	" " "	"	28	34	10	24
6 0 8 1 4 0 0	2 1 0 4	" " "	"	28	34	10	24
6 0 8 1 4 0 0	2 1 0 6	" " "	"	3	59	38	21
6 0 8 1 4 0 0	2 1 0 7	" " "	"	6	56	25	31
6 0 8 1 4 0 0	2 1 0 9	" " "	"	29	33	1	32
6 0 8 1 4 0 0	2 1 1 0	" " "	"	11	51	27	24
6 0 8 1 4 0 0	2 2 0 5	" " "	"	36	26	8	18
6 0 8 1 4 0 0	2 2 0 6	" " "	"	13	49	3	46
6 0 8 1 4 0 0	2 3 0 3	" " "	"	48	14	2	12

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Grade 4 - Fall 1975 (continued)

Component Code	Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils Passing (1)	Pretest No. of Pupils Failing (2)	Posttest No. of Pupils From Col. (2) Passing	Posttest No. of Pupils From Col. (2) Failing
6 0 8 1 4 0 0	2 3 0 4	McGraw Hill; CRT	D Creat	20	42	22	20
6 0 8 1 4 0 0	2 3 0 5	" " "	"	20	42	15	27
6 0 8 1 4 0 0	2 4 0 1	" " "	"	8	54	8	46
6 0 8 1 4 0 0	2 4 0 3	" " "	"	23	39	0	39
6 0 8 1 4 0 0	2 4 0 4	" " "	"	21	41	15	26
6 0 8 1 4 0 0	2 4 0 6	" " "	"	5	57	48	9
6 0 8 1 4 0 0	2 4 0 8	" " "	"	22	40	0	40
6 0 8 1 4 0 0	2 4 0 9	" " "	"	12	50	0	50
6 0 8 1 4 0 0	2 4 1 1	" " "	"	5	57	19	38
6 0 8 1 4 0 0	2 4 1 2	" " "	"	19	43	1	42

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Grade 2 and 3 -Spring 1976 (N=24)

Component Code	Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest		Posttest	
				Passing (1)	Failing (2)	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Passing	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Failing
6 0 8 1 3 0 0 2 1 0 2		Grow Math	Level 1	11	13	7	6
6 0 8 1 3 0 0 2 1 0 4		" " "	"	6	18	9	9
6 0 8 1 3 0 0 2 1 0 5		" " "	"	10	14	8	6
6 0 8 1 3 0 0 2 1 0 6		" " "	"	5	19	14	5
6 0 8 1 3 0 0 2 1 0 7		" " "	"	7	17	13	4
6 0 8 1 3 0 0 2 2 0 5		" " "	"	10	14	8	6
6 0 8 1 3 0 0 2 2 0 3		" " "	"	9	15	6	9
6 0 8 1 3 0 0 2 2 0 4		" " "	"	10	14	7	7

1/

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics, particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use instructional mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Grade 2 and 3 - Spring 1976 (continued)

Component Code	Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Passing (1)	Failing (2)	Pupils Pass Col. (1) Failing	Pupils from Col. (2) Failing
6 0 8 1 3 0 0	2 4 0 1	McGraw [illegible]	[illegible]	3	21	15	6
6 0 8 1 3 0 0	2 4 0 3	" " "	"	3	21	11	10
6 0 8 1 3 0 0	2 4 0 4	" " "	"	8	16	5	11
6 0 8 1 3 0 0	2 4 0 6	" " "	"	1	23	19	4
6 0 8 1 3 0 0	2 4 [illegible] 8	" " "	"	7	17	8	9
6 0 8 1 3 0 0	[illegible]	" " "	"	6	18	3	15
6 0 8 1 3 0 0	[illegible]	" " "	"	6	18	9	9
6 0 8 1 3 0 0	2 4 0 8	" " "	"	1	23	19	4

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Grades 4 and 5 -Spring 1976 (N=73)

Component Code	Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils		Posttest	
				Passing (1)	Failing (2)	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Passing	No. of Pupils from Col. (2) Failing
6 0 8 1 4 0 0	2 1 0 1	McGraw Hill:PRI	B-Green	41	32	29	3
6 0 8 1 4 0 0	2 1 0 2	" " "	"	45	28	25	3
6 0 8 1 4 0 0	2 1 0 4	" " "	"	45	28	25	3
6 0 8 1 4 0 0	2 1 0 6	" " "	"	25	38	29	9
6 0 8 1 4 0 0	2 1 0 7	" " "	"	18	55	44	11
6 0 8 1 4 0 0	2 1 0 9	" " "	"	27	46	20	26
6 0 8 1 4 0 0	2 1 1 0	" " "	"	49	24	22	2
6 0 8 1 4 0 0	2 2 0 5	" " "	"	50	23	19	4
6 0 8 1 4 0 0	2 2 0 6	" " "	"	24	49	26	23
6 0 8 1 4 0 0	2 3 0 3	" " "	"	58	15	8	7

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading and mathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Grades 4 and 5 -Spring 19?? (continued)

Component Code	Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Post-test No. of Pupils		Post-test No. of Pupils from Col. (2)	Post-test No. of Pupils from Col. (2)
				Passing (1)	Failing (2)	Passing	Failing
6 0 8 1 4 0 0	2 3 0	McGrawHill Pkg	B-Grec.	57	16		9
6 0 8 1 4 0 0	2 3 0 5	" " "	"	46	27	21	6
6 0 8 1 4 0 0	2 4 0 1	" " "	"	9	53	6	47
6 0 8 1 4 0 0	2 4 0 3	" " "	"	2?	4	19	35
6 0 8 1 4 0 0	2 4 0 4	" " "	"	50	2?	4	0
6 0 8 1 4 0 0	2 4 0 6	" " "	"	21	52	32	20
6 0 8 1 4 0 0	2 4 0 8	" " "	"	24	89	13	31
6 0 8 1 4 0 0	2 4 0 9	" " "	"	35	38	15	23
6 0 8 1 4 0 0	2 4 1 1	" " "	"	16	57	19	38
6 0 8 1 4 0 0	2 4 1 2	" " "	"	2?	49	33	16

-10-

13. Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) Results.

In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of programs in reading andmmathematics; particularly for those of less than 60 hours duration. Use the Instructional Mastery codes appended to this form for those skills which the program attempted to improve. Please provide data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Grade 5 - Spring 1976 (continued)

Component Code	Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils Passing (1)	Pretest No. of Pupils Failing (2)	Posttest No. of Pupils From Col. (2) Passing	Posttest No. of Pupils From Col. (2) Failing
6 0 8 1 4 0 0	2 4 0 1	McGraw Hill:PR1	C-Blue	0	1	0	1
6 0 8 1 4 0 0	2 4 0 4	" " "	"	0	1	1	0
6 0 8 1 4 0 0	2 4 0 6	" " "	"	0	5	4	1
6 0 8 1 4 0 0	2 4 0 8	" " "	"	0	5	4	1
6 0 8 1 4 0 0	2 4 1 1	" " "	"	0	1	0	1
6 0 8 1 4 0 0	2 4 1 2	" " "	"	0	1	1	0

"